



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

VS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/039,957	03/16/98	KORNBLITH	P 2509-970451

HM12/0913

BARBARA E JOHNSON  
WEBB ZIESENHEIM BRUENING LOGSDON  
ORKIN & HANSON 700 KOPPERS BUILDING  
436 SEVENTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH PA 15219-1818

EXAMINER

GITOMER, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1623

8

DATE MAILED:

09/13/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/039,957

Applicant

Kornblith

Examiner

Ralph Gitomer

Group Art Unit

1623



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 18, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-7, and 9-22 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-7, and 9-22 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

The amendment received 8/18/99 has been entered and claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 are currently pending in this application. The amended title is acceptable.

5

It is understood the present claims are directed to non-malignant cells whereas the claims of 08/679,056 and 09/095,993 are directed to malignant cells. As the function of the methods are identical, the method steps are identical, and the only  
10 difference is the state of the cells in the assay, the rejection of record under 35 USC 101 is hereby withdrawn and converted to obviousness double patenting.

15 The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple  
20 assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

25 A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).  
30 Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 are provisionally rejected under the  
judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting  
as being unpatentable over claims 1-2 of copending Application  
No. 09/095,993. Although the conflicting claims are not  
5 identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other  
because the only difference in the claimed methods is the state  
of the cells.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting  
rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been  
10 patented.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 are rejected under the judicially  
created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being  
unpatentable over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 5,728,541.  
Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not  
15 patentably distinct from each other because the only difference  
in the claimed methods is the state of the cells.

20

25

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

5 (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10 Claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by each of Yen-Maguire, Stampfer, Morgan and Rotman.

15 Yen-Maguire (5,242,806) entitled "Method for Conducting the Cytotoxicity Assays on Tumor Cells" teaches in the abstract, assaying for the sensitivity of biopsied tumor cells to  
20 chemotherapeutic agents. In column 3 first full paragraph, measuring the responsiveness of multiple cell populations rather than single-cell suspensions. In column 3 lines 56-59, the requirement for single cell suspensions is eliminated. In column 10 lines 20-25, even if cells are seeded as aggregates, the cells will spread out.

25 Stampfer (4,423,145) entitled "Enhanced Growth Medium and Method for Culturing Human Mammary Epithelial Cells" teaches in column 3 under "Isolation of Epithelial Clumps," clumps of cells are obtained from a biopsy and then cultured. In column 6 last full paragraph, adriamycin sensitivity to specimens are determined with varying concentrations.

Morgan (5,270,172) entitled "Method to Predict Tumor Response to Therapy" teaches in column 5 Example 1, cancer tissue obtained is minced into fragments and cultured. In column 13 last full paragraph, chemotherapeutic drugs and doses are assayed.

Rotman (4,937,187) entitled "Methods for Separating Malignant Cells From Clinical Specimens" teaches in column 8 in the claims generally and claim 19 specifically, forming clumps of cells from tumor biopsies, establishing a cell culture, exposing the cell culture to a therapeutic agent and determining the sensitivity of the cells to the agent.

It would appear the inventive step is to not disaggregate a biopsy specimen into individual cells before plating but to plate clumps of cells prior to determining chemotherapeutic sensitivity. However, this is not claimed as the present claims are written in open-ended "comprising" terminology which does not exclude disaggregating the specimen and "multicellular particulates" does not define a size of specimen. Mechanically separating as has now been added to the claims is clearly shown in all of the above references where biopsying itself is a method of mechanically separating.

Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/99 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Yen-Maguire may further process the cells to disaggregate them. Stampfer does not mechanically  
5 separate the cells. Morgan does not describe passaging a monolayer derived from the particulates but a suspension instead. Rotman also does not describe passaging a monolayer derived from the particulates.

It is the examiner's position that the claims do not exclude  
10 further processing to disaggregate cells because they are written in open-ended ~~comprising~~ terminology. Stampfer inherently mechanically separates cells, see column 3 lines 14-20 where samples are prepared by gently lacerating the remaining tissue with opposing scalpels after additional dissection. The present  
15 claims are not directed to passaging a monolayer. Morgan in Example I columns 5-6 teaches a thin layer of cells on a slide is grown. Tissue culture monolayer is well known in this art and would have the expected function. In Rotman, see the abstract where fragments from biopsy sample can be prepared by mechanical  
20 dissociation.

Claims 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 10 is directed to a wound healing agent and claim 17 is directed to a gene therapy agent.

The specification as originally filed does not enable one of skill in this art to make and use the presently claimed invention as directed to wound healing and gene therapy agents.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The newly added limitation directed to non-malignant cells is not enabled. On page 6 first full paragraph of the present specification, applications of the invention are discussed including screening process for treatment or therapeutic agents for nonmalignant syndromes and psoriasis or wound healing agents as examples are disclosed. The claims are directed to assessing chemosensitivity of non-malignant cells, a method for identifying chemosensitivity of cells, and a method for identifying secreted cellular antigens produced by cells. The specification as



originally filed does not provide a written description nor enable one of skill in this art how to assess chemosensitivity of non-malignant cells, identify chemosensitivity of cells nor identify any secreted cellular antigens produced by cells. No results of any of these processes are disclosed, and particularly no non-malignant cells are shown. It is understood psoriasis is not a malignant condition but nowhere is it set forth in the specification what the sensitivity of cells associated with psoriasis are chemosensitive to, how one would identify that sensitivity or any antigens produced by those cells. No results of any kind are seen.

Claims 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for for specific markers or factors, does not reasonably provide enablement for any marker or factor. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In claim 13 and all occurrences, the terms "soluble secreted factors", in claim 14 "cellular markers", in claim 21 "biological response modifier" lack enablement as it would require one of ordinary skill in this art undue experimentation to determine which such factor, marker or modifier would work in the instant invention.

"Soluble secreted factors" reads on air which is unlikely to work in the claimed invention.

"Cellular markers" reads on utilization of a nutrient which is unlikely to work in the claimed invention.

5 "Biological response modifier" reads on air which is unlikely to work in the claimed invention.

The entire scope of the claims has not been enabled because:

1. Quantity of experimentation necessary would be undue because of the large proportion of inoperative compounds claimed.
  - 10 2. Amount of direction or guidance presented is insufficient to predict which substances encompassed by the claims would work.
  3. Presence of working examples are only for specific substances and extension to other compounds has not been specifically taught or suggested.
  - 15 4. The nature of the invention is complex and unpredictable.
  5. State of the prior art indicates that most related substances are not effective for the claimed functions.
  6. Level of predictability of the art is very unpredictable.
  7. Breadth of the claims encompasses an innumerable number of
  - 20 compounds.
  8. The level of one of ordinary skill in this art is variable.
- In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)

Applicant's arguments filed 8/18/99 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

All arguments regarding 35 USC 112, first paragraph, will be considered here.

5           Applicant argues that the purpose of the assays is to  
determine whether a chemical could affect the cells cultured  
through use of gene therapy or wound healing agents. The  
treatment would yield expected results determined by the nature  
of the treatment. The treatment method would have already been  
10 known to the skill artisan, if not, there would be no incentive  
to test the agent in its wound healing or gene therapy capacity.  
Selection of candidate agents is routine. The specification  
teaches harvesting separating, growing, inoculating, treating and  
assessing. The claims have been amended to clarify that the  
15 detection of the markers or factors is indicative of a disease  
state and that the markers, factors or modifiers are products of  
or characteristics of the cells.

          It is the examiner's position that the claims are not  
directed to gene therapy or wound healing agents. This rejection  
20 is not based upon how the candidate drugs are selected but that  
the specification does not enable one to obtain the results  
claimed. No agents for wound healing or gene therapy are  
disclosed, no chemosensitivity of non-malignant cells is taught,  
no chemosensitivity is identified and no secreted cellular  
25 antigens are identified. Importantly, no non-malignant cells are

disclosed. That the method steps are shown does not enable the  
claimed method. Regarding the markers or factors, it would  
appear what the markers or factors may be is critical to the  
invention and what is disclosed does not enable the scope of the  
5 claims.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112,  
second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly  
point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant  
10 regards as the invention.

The preamble of claim 1 is directed to assessing  
chemosensitivity of cells but the claim lacks any such step. In  
claim 1(e) sites are treated with treating means which is not  
related to chemosensitivity, no determining takes place, and  
15 correlating sensitivity occurs which is not understood. In claim  
3 ~~the~~ said plurality of segregated sites ~~is~~ lacks antecedent basis.  
In claim 4 and all occurrences ~~of~~ active agent ~~is~~ lacks antecedent  
basis and is not understood as to what activity is intended. In  
claim 4 how the assessment takes place is indefinite and it is  
20 not seen how one could determine optimal sensitivity to a single  
agent in the presence of many agents. In claim 9 ~~the~~ a  
chemotherapeutic agent ~~is~~ would imply malignancy is being treated  
which is inconsistent. In claim 11 ~~the~~ radiation therapy would  
imply malignancy is being treated which is inconsistent. Claims  
25 15, 16 and all related occurrences does not contain steps to

accomplish the preamble. In claim 16(c) and all occurrences, ~~the~~said cohesive multicellular particulates~~the~~ lacks antecedent basis.

5           Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

10           A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened  
15           statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the  
20           statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ralph Gitomer whose telephone number is (703) 308-0732. The examiner  
25           can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

Serial No. 09/039,957  
Art Unit 1623

-13-

The examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marian Knode, can be reached on (703) 308-4311. The fax phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 308-4556.

5 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234.

10

*Ralph Gitomer*

Ralph Gitomer  
Primary Examiner  
Group 1623

RALPH GITOMER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200